



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/689,339	10/12/2000	James D. Bennett	38237A	9853

7590 06/02/2005

John H Sherman Legal Department
Intermec Technologies Corporation
550 2nd Street S E
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401

EXAMINER

FRECH, KARL D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/689,339

Applicant(s)

BENNETT, JAMES D.

Examiner

Karl D. Frech

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15,17-24 and 26-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15,19-24 and 28-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17,18,26,27,35 and 36 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Applicant's amendment filed March 4, 2005 has been considered. The examiner acknowledges that claims 32-36 were inadvertently not addressed with the previous office action. As such, this office action will not be made final. Any inconvenience is regretted.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 15,19,22-24,28,31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Koenck et al 5,898,162. Koenck discloses as seen throughout the figures a hand held apparatus which includes an optical indicia reader (313 in fig 22), a manual input component (514 in fig 22), wireless communication component (504 in fig 22) for RF transmission, an image generator (513 in fig 22). It is seen in figure 1 for example that the display can be in a generally vertical orientation.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.


5. Claims 20,21,29,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koenck et al 5,898,162. Koenck discloses that which is seen above. Koenck discloses that the light generation source for the scanner component is an LED. Koenck does not disclose that the light source is a laser. However, laser scanners, laser diodes are old and well known in the optical scanner art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a laser as a light generation source for the scanner of Koenck. Due to the lack of criticality of the exact light generation source in the current disclosure, and since laser diodes and LEDs are highly interchangeable in the optical scanner art, using a laser in place of the LED of Koenck would be a matter of engineering design choice. One might choose the laser in order for its ready availability, cost effectiveness and its high intensity. Contrary to the current claims, Koenck discloses that the image display and keypad are coplanar, not non-parallel. However, this too would be a matter of design choice, as various configurations of keypad/display hand held units is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention to produce non-parallel keypad/display configuration for ergonomic considerations as the human eye tends to look forward (for the vertical display) but the fingers are more comfortable in the horizontal entry position, much like a desk top computer.
6. Claims 17,18,26,27,35,36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, for the same reasons as previously set forth.

7. Applicant's arguments filed March 4, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Koenck does not disclose "projecting" the visual image onto a planar region as now recited in the claims. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner points out that the display screen of Koenck is a planar visual image screen.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl D. Frech whose telephone number is (571) 272-2390. The examiner can normally be reached on maxi-flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Karl D Frech
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876
